



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,166	06/27/2001	Raphael Schlanger	01-396	4513

7590

03/28/2003

Robert H. Bachman
BACHMAN & LaPOINTE, P.C.
Suite 1201
900 Chapel Street
New Haven, CT 06510-2802

EXAMINER

BELLINGER, JASON R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3617

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKETT NO.
09/493,166	6/27/01	Schlanger	01-396

EXAMINER	
J. Bellinger	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3617	7

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. William Slate (3) Mr. Jason Bellinger
(2) Mr. Russell Storer (4) Raphael Schlanger

Date of interview 3/27/03

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached.

Claims discussed: proposed amended claim sample

Identification of prior art discussed: Blean, Savene, Lacombe et al, Rasmussen, Thompson, Jr., Fujisaki et al

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed breadth of

proposed claims and necessity of expanded search of art. Discussed that proposed method claims are considered a separate "invention" and would be restricted to a different class if submitted. Discussed pretension aspect of proposed claim 123 and its relevance to prior art. Interference of aspect of claim 126 would be considered undis closed for elected embodiment
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Jason R Bellinger
Examiner's Signature